DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 087 SP 039 761

AUTHOR	Peterson, Karen; Bercik, Janet
TITLE	Frame Theory Analysis of the Cultures of Three Outstanding Teacher Induction Programs.
PUB DATE	1995-10-00
NOTE	40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, October 11-14, 1995).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Mentors; *Partnerships in Education; Program Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This study comparatively analyzed three exemplary beginning teacher induction programs that involved university-school district collaboration. Researchers sent letters to leading researchers in the field of induction and mentoring requesting nominations of exemplary programs. They made contact with nine of the programs and interviewed program coordinators about program organization and demographics. They looked at program components (e.g., mentoring, orientation for beginning teachers, handbooks, and stipends). They also collected data on excellence criteria (successful implementation factors, program goal attainment, and site specific goals). Data analysis provided information on positive variables seen across three exemplary sites using frame analysis theory. Each of four frames is discussed, highlighting variables in each frame which the data indicate had the most positive impact on the programs: (1) structural frame (formal structure tight/loose, research-based, change built into the structure, and outcomes/impact); (2) human resource frame (leadership people/task-centered, feedback process, reflective practice, teacher professionalization/job enlargement, close to the customer, personal/professional support, confidence building, and peer support component); (3) political frame (interaction/fit of players); and (4) symbolic frame (win-win, emphatic responses, and part of the larger management philosophy). (Contains 13 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 450 087

SP

FRAME THEORY ANALYSIS OF THE CULTURES OF THREE OUTSTANDING TEACHER INDUCTION PROGRAMS

By

KAREN PETERSON, Ed.D.
GOVERNORS STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK, IL

&

JANET BERCIK, Ed.D.
NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO, IL

Paper presented at the meeting of the
MidWestern Educational Research Association
October 11-14, 1995, Chicago, IL

SP039761

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The current educational reform movement began in earnest in 1983 with "A Nation at Risk," the report of the National Commission in Education. Since that time, the nation has been inundated with numerous reports and innumerable reform measures seeking to cure the ills of our nation's schools. One strong emphasis is moving teaching to a more professional level. The surge of new teacher induction programs since the early 1980's has been one illustration of this phenomenon. Leslie Huling-Austin (1990) defines induction as "a transitional period in teacher education, between preservice preparation and continuing professional development, during which assistance may be provided and/or assessment may be applied to beginning teachers" (p. 3). The intent of all induction programs is to transform a student teacher graduate into a competent career teacher (Schlechty, 1985). What is now developing is a new emphasis on the transition phase of the teacher career continuum; preservice - induction - inservice. Formal induction programs provide continuity between the closely supervised preservice experience and the assumption of full classroom responsibilities (Griffin, 1985; Hall,1982). The fact that there has been a proliferation of programs in a time of

limited funding highlights the need for such programming. More than 25 states now mandate some form of extended teacher training (Stenning, Brown, Peterson, & Sultis, 1993).

It is a widely accepted premise that schools of the future will need more quality teachers to meet the demands of our rapidly evolving technological society. Serious consideration, therefore, must be given to the important issues of attraction and retention of outstanding teachers. Many excellent candidates either are not entering the field of education or are leaving in substantial numbers once they have taught. Almost 50% of teachers leave the field by their seventh year of teaching (Carnegie, 1986; Darling-Hammond, 1984; Schlechty & Vance, 1981,1983; Shanker, 1987). A disproportionate number of those who leave are among the most academically able. For example, while overall, 5.7% of teachers departed from the teaching profession in a North Carolina study, 11.5% of those scoring in the top 10% left, doubling the attrition rate for the top academic teacher candidates (Schlechty & Vance, 1981).

In light of the reform movement, the crisis in the teaching profession, and the basic difficulty with the lack of professionalism in the career socialization of teachers, new teacher induction has become a burgeoning part of the educational landscape.

Overview of the Study

This study is a comparative analysis of three exemplary teacher induction programs. Three individual case studies were done at three outstanding university/multi-district programs using frame theory analysis of the cultures of the three programs. A two-stage sampling process was undertaken. First, outstanding programs were selected based on analysis of the literature, recommendations of researchers, and identified programs which have received awards. These programs were then designated as nominees for final selection. Coordinators of the selected sites were interviewed in order to gather data to determine selection of the final three exemplary induction programs.

Once selected, the researcher analyzed archival/historical data in detail. Each site was visited for a period of three days, following a formal case study protocol developed by the researcher. The basic data collection strategies were non-participant observation, interviews, questionnaires, and study of archival/historical data.

Bolman and Deal's (1984) four frames (political, human resource, structural, and symbolic) were the basic structures for data analysis. The study of organizational culture has evolved from the work of business

management. According to Deal and Kennedy (1982) " . . . culture has a powerful influence throughout an organization; it affects practically everything . . . Because of this impact, we think that culture also has a major effect on the success of the business." (p.4). Bolman and Deal's frame theory provides a theoretical framework for the systematic analysis of an organizational culture.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to identify exemplary university/school district collaborative induction programs in order to determine variables which contribute to program success. This data may be useful to districts and/or universities seeking to implement or improve induction programming.

Site Selection Process

A two-stage sampling process was used in the selection of the three exemplary sites, based on the model of Wise and Darling-Hamond's (1985) study of effective teacher evaluation practices.

In the first stage, letters were sent to 45 leading researchers in the field of induction and mentoring, requesting three nominations of

exemplary programs. Eighteen postcards with nominations were returned. From a review of the literature in this area, other award winning programs were added to the reputational sample. In addition, the researcher attended the national conference of the Association of Teacher Educators in January, 1993 and was able to meet with induction researchers for additional input at the ATE Mentor Workshop session. As a result of these strategies, nine sites selected in the first stage of the sampling process: Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona; Ohio County Schools, Wheeling, West Virginia; University of Wisconsin, Whitewater, Wisconsin; North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina; University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, Colorado; Richardson Public Schools, Richardson, Texas; University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico; Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky; and San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

The second stage of the sampling process was done from January to March, 1993. Initial contact was made and program coordinators were interviewed. Introductory letters were sent, explaining the research, the fact that the site was recommended as exemplary, and was being considered as one of the final three sites for the study. The letter indicated that a follow-up phone call would be made in order to arrange a

convenient time for an in-depth interview for the second stage of the site selection process. The interviews were based on three areas of site selection criteria; program organization/demographics, program components, and excellence criteria.

The program organization/demographics interview questions requested information about the program type, number of districts serviced, and funding source and cost distribution. Details about the years in operation, number of teachers involved, and population served were also requested.

The second site selection information sheet involved the breakdown of program components. Respondents were asked about specifics of their program form, including such items as if the program included mentoring, orientation meetings for beginning teachers, handbook or newsletters, stipends, and release time for new teachers.

The final component of the site selection criteria regarded excellence criteria. This information was categorized in two ways: a) successful implementation factors and b) program goal attainment. Successful implementation factors were derived from the Wise and Darling-Hammond (1985) study, and included organizational commitment to the program, procedures for ensuring support competence,

compatability of induction program with other management strategies, and positive collaboration. The second section of the excellence criteria regarded goal attainment based on major induction gaols; retention of beginning teachers, providing assistance, improving performance, and contributing to the professionalization of teaching. One further item, site specific goals was also included in this section. For both sections of the excellence criteria, the program coordinators were asked if program goals were attained, and if successful implementation factors were in evidence at their particular site. When they responded positively, they were then asked to indicate the extent to which their assessment was based on evaluation of the project or merely self-reported information. The following tables indicate the responses of the program coordinators of the nine sites selected in the first stage of the sampling process.

Site Selection Criteria - Organization/Demographics

SITE	T,AZ	W,WV	W,WI	R,NC	G,CO	R,TX	A,NM	
Program Type	2 site, multi-district	district	multi-district, university	multi-district, university	multi-district, university	district	multi-district university	State/univ. district
State Mandated?	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no	yes
Funding	$25,000	$3,600	univ. $15,000 district, $300 per	$100,000	exchange of service approx. $1.5 million	not available	exchange of services	state
Cost Distribution ?	state, district, university	district/state RESA-6 regional agency	university/ district	state/university district	districts	district	university/ districts	state
Program Operation	7 years	12 years	19 years	8 years	19-20 years	7 years	9 years	9 years
Area	urban suburban	small city (50,000)	primarily rural	urban suburban rural	urban suburban rural	suburban	urban suburban rural	urban
Current # of New Teachers	58	26	9	>500	over 100	approx. 150	approx. 300	202
Teachers 3 Years	approx. 300	75-100	52	>700	approx. 250	approx. 600	approx. 850	approx. 600
Number of Districts	4	NA	3	18	13	1	3	1
Minority Population	2 districts approx. 30%	2%	none	wide range	wide range	approx. 25%	>50%	31%

Note: The San Diego State University, San Diego, CA site was withdrawn from consideration at the request of the program coordinator because it is not operating at optimal level due to funding cuts.

T,AZ = Arizona State Univ., Tempe, AZ
W,WV = Ohio Co. Schools, Wheeling WV
W,WI = Univ. of Wisconsin, Whitewater, WI
R,NC = North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh, NC
G,CO = Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greely, CO
R,TX = Richardon Public Schools, Richardson, TX
A,NM = Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
L,KY = Jefferson Co. Public Schools, Louisville, KY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Site Selection - Program Components

SITE	T,AZ	W,WV	W,WI	R,NC	G,CO	R,TX	A,NM	L,KY
Orientation Meetings for New Teachers	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Seminars		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mentors	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Formal Mentor Training	X	X	X	X	X	Optional	X	X
Release Time for Mentors	X	X	X	X	X		Full Time	X
Stipends		X	Some	X	X		X	X
Release Time for New Teachers		X	X	X	X	X		
Different Responsibilities for Inductees					X			
Different Assessment Model for New Teachers		X			X	X		X
Inductee Peer Support Groups		X		X	X		X	X
Handbook/Newsletter		X		X	X	X	X	X
Induction Team Members	M/I	M/I P	M/I U	M/I P/DEP T. Chair	M/I P/U	M/I Asst. Princ.	M/I U	M/I P/U
Mentor Evaluates								X
Formal Evaluation of Program		X		X	X	X	X	

Note: The San Diego State University, San Diego, CA site was withdrawn from consideration at the request of the program coordinator because it is not operating at optimal level due to funding cuts.

T,AZ = Arizona State Univ., Tempe, AZ
W,WV = Ohio Co. Schools, Wheeling WV
W,WI = Univ. of Wisconsin, Whitewater, WI
R,NC = North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh, NC
G,CO = Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greely, CO
R,TX = Richardon Public Schools, Ricnardson, TX
A,NM = Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
L,KY = Jefferson Co. Public Schools, Louisville, KY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Site Selection - Excellence Criteria

SITE	T,AZ	W,WV	W,WI	R,NC	G,CO	R,TX	A,NM	L,KY
SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS (WISE/DARLING-HAMMOND)								
Organizational Commitment To Program	SR	RE	SR	RE	RE	SR	SR	RE
Procedures for Ensuring Support Competence		SR	SR	RE	SR	RE	SR	RE
Compatability of Induction Program w/Other Management Strategies		SR	SR	RE	SR	SR	SR	RE
Positive Collaboration	SR	SR	SR	RE	RE	RE	RE	SR
PROGRAM GOAL ATTAINMENT								
Rentention		SR		RE	RE	SR	RE	[a]
Providing Assistance	RE	RE	SR	RE	SR	SR	SR	SR[a]
Improving Performance	RE	SR	SR	RE	RE	SR	RE	SR[a]
Professionalization of Teaching	RE	SR	SR	RE	SR	SR	RE	SR[a]
Site Specific Goals		SR		RE	SR	SR	RE	[a]

Note: The San Diego State University, San Diego, CA site was withdrawn from consideration at the request of the program coordinator because it is not operating at optimal level due to funding cuts. SR = Self-Reported. RE = Research/Evaluation-Based.

[a] Data available in state data base, but it has not been aggregated.

T,AZ = Arizona State Univ., Tempe, AZ
W,WV = Ohio Co. Schools, Wheeling WV
W,WI = Univ. of Wisconsin, Whitewater, WI
R,NC = North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh, NC
G,CO = Univ. of Northern Colorado, Greely, CO
R,TX = Richardon Public Schools, Richardson, TX
A,NM = Univ. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM
L,KY = Jefferson Co. Public Schools, Louisville, KY

Based on this data, it was determined that the final three sites selected would be the University of Northern Colorado, Greeley; the University of New Mexico, Albuqquerque; and North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

Data Collection Strategies

Bogdan and Biklen (1982) state that the basic techniques of qualitative research are observation, participant observation, reviewing of various documents and artifacts and open-ended interviewing. Due to the limited time in the field, the researcher also included questionnaires in order to widen the scope of the data and strengthen the triangulation process. Collection of archival/historical information was the first stage of the data collection. Once the three sites were selected, the researcher requested that archival/historical information be sent, so that it could be examined and analyzed thoroughly before the site visits. This included general information on the district or site, as well as specific data on the induction programming.

Site visits were made following the guidelines of the multi-site visit protocol (shown below) developed to ensure replication of data collection strategies and analysis across sites.

Multi-Site Visit Protocol

This protocol has been developed in order to assure the greatest level of consistency in data collection strategies across sites as possible.

The research methodology in this study will include:

-Extensive review and data reduction of archival/historical data prior to each site visit.

-Establishment of working relationship with program coordinator via mail and phone contact prior to each visit, establishing an interview schedule prior to arrival.

-Visitation of each site for three days. At each site:

-Be given a tour/overview of program/facilities by coordinator.

-Attendance at one formal induction session/meeting, is possible.

-Provide qustionnaires to program administrators for distribution of 20 each to mentors and inductees. It is recommended that ten of the participants from each category be selected by program coordinators. The remaining ten will be randomly selected. Depending on the number of principals involved at each of the three program sites, the coordinator and researcher will determine

an appropriate number of principal questionnaires to be distributed.

-Interviews

-Two mentors and two inductees from the current year's program. one from each category will be recommended by the coordinator and one will be randomly selected.

-Superintendent or district office representative, union representative, board member, principal, state contact, and university representative, as applicable.

-At lease 1/3 of each day will be spent in non-participant observation.

-On going consultation with program coordinator.

Site Visits

Site visits were scheduled with three coordinators of the selected programs: Dr. Jean Casey, the University of New Mexico; Dr. Alan Reiman, North Carolina State University; and Dr. Doug MacIsaac, the University of Northern Colorado.

Materials were sent to the coordinators prior to the visit, with information describing the research design and the site visit protocol

describing requested procedures in order to assure the greatest level of consistency in data collection strategies across sites as possible.

Archival/Historical data were sent to the researcher prior to the visits, including program descriptions, journal articles, and operational materials. At least nine archival/historical documents from each site were used in the data analysis process (see table below).

As outlined in the protocol, the researcher met with district personnel, building administrators, mentors, and inductees at each of the three sites. Open-ended questionnaires were distributed to mentors, inductees, and principals. On-going consultation with the coordinators was a major component of the site visits, and at each site, the researcher was able to attend a formal or informal gathering of mentors and/or inductees. Numerous field notes were developed from time spent in non-participant observation. A sampling of the archival/historical data was used for the formal coding and analysis, including program description in the form of a brochure and/or journal articles, newsletters, and administrative paperwork. The final breakdown of the data analyzed to ensure the strength of the triangulation process is contained in the following table.

Data Collection Sources by Site

Source of Information	Location					
	UNC		UNM		NCSU	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Mentor Questionnaires	10	50	8	40	5	25
Mentor Interviews	2		4		5	
Inductee Questionnaires	8	40	27	100	6	30
Inductee Interviews	1		2		2	
Principal Questionnaires	1	10	5	50	3	30
Administrator Interviews	3		2		3	
Archival/Historical Documents	9		10		9	

Field Notes and Miscellaneous Data (including interviews with program coordinators)

The data were analyzed using the in-process worksheets based on Bolman and Deal's four frames. Items were coded fitting under a category of the in-process worksheets if they were either mentioned in the data or an example of the criteria was suggested. The following in-process worksheets of Bolman and Deal's four frames were adapted and refined during the course of the study and provided the framework for the data analysis.

Worksheets for Data Analysis

Bolman and Deal

Structural Frame:

1. Formal structure
2. Formal/informal roles
3. Standard operating procedures
4. Program components
5. Decision-making process
6. Change process
7. Program evaluation
8. Mentor selection/training
9. Prepared information
10. Personnel selection
11. Time considerations
12. Retention rates
13. Mentor/inductee match-ups
14. Assistance/assessment
15. Formal evaluation of inductees
16. Program content
17. Collaboration
18. Funding
19. Program flexibility
20. Inductee selection/placement
21. Program Differentiation
22. Structure/environment match
23. Change built into the structure
24. Research-based
25. Course credit
26. Theory to practice
27. Quality control
28. Networking
29. Outcomes/impact
30. Communication
31. Retention
32. Coursework advantage

Political Frame

1. Resources, internal/external
2. Monetary issues/control of rewards
3. Power/responsibility
4. Change
5. Bargaining and compromise
6. Coalitions
7. Interaction/Fit of players
8. Funding
9. Participant selection process
10. Policies
11. Mandates
12. Legal constraints/agreements
13. Change process

Human Resource Frame

1. Leaders, task/people centered
2. Work environment
3. Informal groups
4. Individual needs
5. Attitudes
6. Human relations/pr skills
7. Participant decision-making
8. Human interaction
9. Job enlargement
10. Perception of individuals
11. Mentor training
12. Collegiality
13. Theory X, Theory Y
14. Special considerations/benefits for participants
15. Peer support component
16. Focus on needs
17. Value of coursework
18. Availability of resources
19. Reflective practice
20. Teacher professionalization
21. Organizaed retreats

22, Feedback process
23. Personal and professional support
24. Helped most by . . .
25. Stages of concern/socialization process
26. Self-esteem/confidence building
27. Mentor/inductee relationship

Symbolic Frame

1. People's faith in the program
2. Shared values
3. Process to determine values
4. Myths
5. Rituals
6. Ceremonies
7. Organizational play
8. Humor
9. Trust
10. Beliefs
11. Mission statement
12. Motto/symbols/quotes
13. Goals
14. Quality manifestations
15. Vision
16. Role models/program as model
17. Part of larger management philosophy
18. Viewed as pay-back
19. Win-Win situation
20. Accountability/High expectations
21. Commitment
22. Emphatic answers

Data Analysis

The qualitative data analysis of this study was undertaken using a format adapted from the work of Miles and Hubeman (1984). A table was developed for each of the items in the in-process worksheets, adapted from Bolman and Deal's frame theory. These tables list the data sources as follows:

A/H Doc	Archival/historical documents
ADM/Q&I	Questionnaires and interviews with district administrators
M/Q&I	Mentor questionnaires and interviews
I/Q&I	Inductee questionnaires and interviews
FN/Misc	Field notes and misc. (including interviews with program coordinators).

The (f) signifies the number of times (frequency) the item was mentioned or referred to for each category. The percentage (%) refers to the percentage of individuals in each category (administrators, mentors, and inductees) who mentioned or referred to that category. For example, in the sample table below, the data analysis can be explained as follows: Relating to the concept of "Win-Win," Symbolic Frame item #19, in the quesionnaires completed or interviews of administrators, there were 15 references made. At the University of New Mexico there was a total of 7 interviews/questionnaires with administrators. The figure of 15

indicates that some administrators referred to that concept more than once. The frequency figure in the charts indicates the number of times to which that concept was referred. Many data sources had multiple references to a particular concept, and that strong emphasis is illustrated by the frequency number. The percentage figure, given only for administrators', mentors', and inductees' questionnaires and interviews, signifies the percentage of individuals in each category giving that response. For example, 57% of the University of New Mexico administrators, either in questionnaires or interviews gave reference to that concept. There were seven administrators in that category; therefore four of the seven made reference to that concept, and it is listed as a 57% response on the chart. The totals in the right hand column are figures for the combined totals of the three sites. The totals at the bottom of each chart indicate the frequency of the mention of or reference to that concept at each site, with a grand total in the bottom right hand column.

Symbolic #19 - Win-Win

Data	UNM (f)	%	UNC (f)	%	NCSU (f)	%	Total (f)	%
A/H Doc	10	-	15	-	10	-	35	-
Adm/Q&I	15	57	7	75	13	50	35	65
M/Q&I	21	75	31	83	17	70	69	76
I/Q&I	35	72	18	78	4	38	57	67
FN/Misc	15	-	4	-	11	-	30	-
TOTALS	96		75		55		226	

A table such as the above was prepared for each of the items in the In-Process Worksheets.

Findings

What specific aspects of Bolman and Deal's four frames can be identified as having positive impact regarding these programs?

Positive Variables Found Across Three Exemplary Collaborative Induction Sites Using Frame Theory Analysis

Structural Frame

-Formal Structure Tight/Loose
-Research-Based
-Change Built into the Structure
-Outcomes/Impact

Human Resource Frame

-Leadership People/Task Centered
-Feedback Process
-Reflective Practice
-Teacher Professionalization/Job Enlargement
-Close to the Customer
-Personal/Professional Support
-Confidence Building
-Peer Support Component

Political Frame

-Interaction/Fit of Players

Symbolic Frame

-Win-Win
-Emphatic Responses
-Part of the Larger Management Philosophy

Each of Bolman and Deal's four frames can be viewed as having items positively impacting the success of these programs. Each of the four frames will be discussed, highlighting variables in each frame which the data indicate had the most positive impact on the programs.

Structural Frame

In the Structural Frame, the items that were noted most strongly in the data were Formal Structure Tight/Loose, Research-Based, Change Built into the Structure, and Outcomes/Impact.

Formal Structure Tight/Loose. One of the strongest areas of response in the Structural Frame regarded the Tight/Loose properties of program form. The organization of these programs are tightly structured in that there are very formal procedures in program organization operation, including accountability procedures. On the other hand, the structures are loose enough to meet site specific needs and facilitate innovation and change.

Research-Based. Another variable with a significant response, and

one I view as being critical to the quality of these programs, is the fact that the programs are grounded in research. In the Structural Frame, this was found in the data not only under Research-based, but also under Theory to Practice and Assistance/Assessment. The induction research emphasizes that mentors should assist rather than assess. Research-Based and Theory to Practice are overriding topics regarding research in the Structural Frame. Other examples of specific areas regarding research can be found in the other frames as well and will be discussed there.

Change Built into the Structure. Another Structural Frame item with strong emphasis across sites is that Change is Built into the Structure of these programs. Respondents were not directly questioned about this and participants may not have been directly aware of this type of managerial issue. The researcher was, however, able to view indicators of the strength of this variable by the coordinators' use of program evaluations, the commitment to "keeping current," and the evidence of program flexibility. The program coordinators were committed to program improvement, and change was built into the structure to facilitate the process.

Outcomes/Impact. The Structural Frame item with the strongest response was Outcomes/Impact. Participants emphatically indicated that these programs had educational impact, and this may be viewed as another indicator of the excellence of these programs.

Human Resource Frame

Of the four frames, the Human Resource had the most variables with strong response in the data. The items which were particularly strong were Leadership People/Task Centered, Feedback Process, Reflective Practice, Teacher Professionalization, Job Enlargement, Close to the Customer, Personal/Professional Support, Confidence Building, and Peer Support Component.

Leadership People/Task Centered. One strong point made by participants was the strength of the leadership skills of the directors of these three induction programs. They emphasized that programs were run effectively and that the human dimension -- the personal leadership qualities of the directors -- was critical to program success.

Feedback Process and Reflective Practice. These were two Human

Resource variables that were discussed under the major topic of the program having a strong research ground. The induction research is clear on the importance of the Feedback Process and Reflective Practice. The induction research emphasizes formal observation with feedback and each program provided a stucture for mentors and/or field consultants to make formal observations and provide feedback to inductees. Reflective practice was a variable with strong response at all three sites. Journal writing and other assignments requiring reflection were part of the required coursework in all three programs.

Teacher Professionalization and Job Enlargement. The enhancement of teacher professionalization was evident on two levels in these programs: 1) Job enlargement for experienced teachers was provided as they took on expanded roles and enhanced leadership skills by serving as mentors. 2) Teacher skills and development were enhanced through program training. The second point is particularly true for the beginning teachers as the programs provide assistance in the developmental process of teacher socialization. They also enhance the skills of experienced teachers as they reflect on their own teaching and are exposed to new teaching strategies through program training and the experience of

working with enthusiastic, recently-educated beginning teachers.

Close to the Customer. The strong response to this variable helps underscore the importance of the human dimension in these programs. Although all three of these programs service a large number of teachers participants felt close ties with leadership.

Personal/Professional Support. The variable which received the strongest response of the 102 items in the In-Process Worksheets was this item regarding the personal/professional support provided through these programs. Ninety-eight percent of inductees emphasized this point in some fashion. The support component is central to beginning teacher induction and is one of the reasons the Human Resource Frame is highlighted in this analysis.

Peer Support Component. Another indicator of the importance of the human dimension in these programs is the strong response to the item regarding the Peer Support component. There were 111 references to this item. At every level of the programs, participants had the opportunity to garner support from interacting with peers. Required coursework provided

this opportunity at all three sites - for inductees at the University of New Mexico and the University of Northern Colorado, and for mentors at North Carolina State. At Colorado, mentors had the option of a free course of mentor training and field consultants had regular work sessions together. In New Mexico, mentors had weekly formal sessions, and many of them weekly informal sessions. In North Carolina, many districts in the Mentor Network provided inductee support sessions. Dr. Reiman and Dr. Thies-Sprinthall, the coordinators of the network, noted that they were working to implement inductee support sessions throughout the Network.

Confidence Building. The final item that received a very strong response in the Human Resource Frame was Self Esteem/Confidence Building. This is in line with Fuller's (1969) Stages of Concern. At the first stage of the teacher socialization process, beginning teachers are focused on survival skills, with focus on "self." It is therefore part of the mentoring process to build confidence in proteges, assisting the beginning teachers in moving on to focus on "task" and "students' needs." The data indicate that these excellent programs facilitate the process of enhancing self-esteem and building beginning teachers' confidence.

Since induction programming is grounded in providing support for

beginning teachers, it makes sense that the Human Resource Frame should be highlightred in this study. Beginning teachers are getting personal and professional support at a very emotionally trying time. The human dimension is an integral part of this process.

Symbolic Frame

Three areas of the Symbolic Frame which had the strongest emphasis in the data were Win-Win, Emphatic Answers, and Part of the Larger Management Philosophy. Analysis of the Symbolic Frame was not as clear-cut as the Structural Frame and Human Resource Frame items. Symbolic items are generally more abstract and may take more time to uncover in reading the culture of an organization. This is an area that could benefit from further study.

Win-Win. The most significant variable in the Symbolic Frame was the Win-Win item. More than 226 responses in the data indicated that participants found the program of benefit to themselves and/or others. Many of the other Symbolic Frame items fall under this excellence indicator as well: People's Faith in Program, Quality Manifestations, and Program as a Model. Participants highly regard involvement in the

programs and honor the excellent standards. Below is the model on which this variable is grounded. Dr. Keith Auger of the University of New Mexico outlined the benefits to all participants.

Induction Programming - Win-Win Model

Inductees	Mentors	District/ Principal	Union	University
provides supported entry	released to work with university	extra help within school structure	career devpt. oppportu-nity	melding practice with theory
improves job placement opportunities	renewal opportunities for veteran teachers	training for future administrators	training for union leadership	resource pool of clinical faculty
tuition-waved masters degree program	exposure to current trends	foster other collaborative efforts	impacting retention rates of new teachers	reduces ratios in undergrad. preparation courses

adapted from interview with Keith Auger, University of New Mexico

Emphatic Answers. Another interesting item in the Symbolic Frame is the fact that there were 139 instances of emphatic responses. Fifty-

two percent of inductees either interviewed or having completed questionnaires responded emphatically in some fashion. This usually meant an underlined answer on a questionnaire or an answer from an interview that necessitated an exclamation point when transcribed. The high level of positive response in this fashion is another symbolic indicator of the excellence of these programs.

Part of the Larger Management Philosophy. Administrators particularly emphasized the concept of the programs being Part of the Larger Management Philosophy. The universities and school districts involved in these programs are strongly committed to collaborative networking and this contributes to the success of these programs. This item may also be viewed from a political standpoint and could be considered under the Political Frame as well.

Political Frame

The Political Frame was the most difficult to anlayze in the short time frame of this study. As mentioned previously, Being Part of the Larger Management Philosophy might be considered a Political Frame item. The one item in the Political Frame In-Process Worksheets which had

significant response was Interaction/Fit of Players. Administrators had the strongest response to this item with more than 70% across the three sites making reference to this concept. This is an indication that the collaborative players worked effectively together.

More work can be done specifically regarding analysis of the Symbolic and Political frames in analysis of beginning teacher induction programs. The Structural and Human Resource Frames appreared to be the most basic areas for this type of program and this type of analysis. Both Symbolic and Political nuances of a culture take more time and subjective analysis. This was difficult to accomplish in a short time frame, when there were so many more obvious variables to deal with in the other two frames. It would be a very valuable exercise to focus more explicitly on these two particular areas.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This comparative analysis of exemplary collaborative induction programs was an exploatory study seeking to determine variables contributing to program success. There are three main areas of utilization of this study: a) It may be seen as a resource for those either seeking to

begin or improve existing induction programs. b) It may be used as a resource for those who are researching other areas which are closely related to the topic, particularly those who are doing frame theory analysis of organiztional culture. c) It may be used as a vehicle for further research in this specific area - collaborative induction programming.

REFERENCES

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Griffin, G. (1985). Teacher induction: Research issues. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 42-46.

Hall, G. E. (1982). Beginning teacher induction: Five dilemmas. The Proceedings from a Public Forum. Research on the Improvement Process in Schools and Colleges. (R & D Report No. 3153). Austin, TX: Texas University, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W. R. Houston, (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education. (pp. 535-548). New York, NY: McMillan.

Miles, M. S. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Schlechty, P. C. (1985). A Framework for evaluating induction into teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 37-41.

Schlechty, P. C. & Vance, V. S. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(2), 106-112.

Schlechty, P. C. & Vance, V. S. (1983). Institutional responses to the quality/quantity issue in teacher training. Phi Delta Kappan, 94-101.

Shanker, A. (1987). Tomorrow's teachers. Teachers College Record, 88(3), 423-429.

Stenning, W.F., Brown, Clayrine, M., Peterson, S. F., & Sultis, B.A. (1993). The mentoring of first year teachers: What we know. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Teacher Education, San Diego, CA.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W. & Bernstein, H. T. (1985). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Elementary School Journal. 86(1), 61-121.